



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/608,371	06/30/2003	Sung Su Jung	8733.846.00-US	6412
30827	7590	04/01/2005	EXAMINER	
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP			CHUNG, DAVID Y	
1900 K STREET, NW			ART UNIT	
WASHINGTON, DC 20006			PAPER NUMBER	
			2871	
DATE MAILED: 04/01/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

EX

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/608,371	Applicant(s) JUNG ET AL.	
	Examiner David Y. Chung	Art Unit 2871	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 March 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-51 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 30-51 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2 and 7-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3-6 and 14-29 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4 January 2005</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of group I in the reply filed on January 6, 2005 is acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

1. Claims 1, 7-9 and 11-13 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chin et al. (U.S. 6,593,992).

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

As to claims 1 and 11-13, Chin et al. discloses a method of fabricating an LCD device involving forming a main seal pattern and a dummy seal pattern. Note in figures 4B, the main seal pattern 14 and dummy seal pattern 15 formed on substrate 19. Chin et al. discloses that both seal patterns can be formed by either a screen printing method or a dispensing method. See column 1, line 66 – column 2, line 11. Therefore, Chin et al. gives explicit fruition to forming the main seal pattern by screen printing and the dummy seal pattern by dispensing. Chin et al. discloses that the liquid crystal layer can be formed by either injection or dropping the liquid crystal onto either of the substrates. See column 6, lines 15-25. Although Chin et al. does not disclose curing the seal patterns, this was inherent.

As to claims 7 and 8, Chin et al. discloses that the seal patterns are hardened by heating. See column 5, lines 60-65.

As to claim 9, Chin et al. discloses forming spacer to maintain a cell gap on the active regions. See column 6, lines 1-6.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 2 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chin et al. (U.S. 6,593,992) in view of Kim et al. (U.S. 6,819,391).

Chin et al. does not disclose irradiating the seal patterns with UV light to cure them. Kim et al. discloses that using UV curable seal material was obvious for avoiding the contamination problems associated with thermo-hardening. See column 2, lines 6-9. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use UV curable seal material in order to avoid contamination problems.

3. Claim 10 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chin et al. (U.S. 6,593,992) in view of Tamai et al. (U.S. 5,880,803).

Chin et al. does not disclose column spacers that include a photosensitive organic resin. Tamai et al. shows that it was well known that spacers can be formed of organic resins such polyimide, acrylic resin, and negative photoresist. See column 5, lines 48-56. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use an organic photosensitive resin because it constituted the use of a proven technology.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2-6 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: none of the prior art taught or suggested the claimed seal composition.

Claims 14-18 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: none of the prior art taught or suggested aligning a mask with a plurality of openings over a region corresponding to a plurality of display panels and forming the sealant material within the plurality of openings

Claims 19-27 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: none of the prior art taught or suggested further forming a plurality of alignment marks on either of the substrates.


Art Unit: 2871

Claims 28 and 29 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: none of the prior art taught or suggested a third seal pattern formed at a periphery of the dummy seal pattern.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Chung whose telephone number is (571) 272-2288. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 am to 5:00 pm.


ROBERT H. KIM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

David Chung
GAU 2871
03/18/05